UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,566	05/31/2001	Jyotirmoy Paul	50277-1607	2691

29989 7590 09/15/2004

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
1600 WILLOW STREET
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, TRONG NHAN P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/872,566	PAUL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jack P Nguyen	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/31/01.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 are being examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-6 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Kanevsky, 6,300,947, (hereafter Kanevsky).

4. As per claims 1, Kanevsky teaches a method for interacting with a client process on a mobile device (113d, fig. 1) connected to a network over a wireless link, the method comprising the steps of:

managing information at a mobile applications server (107, fig. 1; *now referred to as web page adapter server or WPAS*) executing on a platform connected to the network, the information including device profile information about the mobile device (col. 6, Lines 20-27); receiving from an application first data (data received from web site) describing a plurality of graphical elements for display on the mobile device ; determining whether the first data exceeds a capacity of the mobile device based on the device profile information; and if it is determined that the first data exceeds the capacity, then forming a subset (converted data processed by WPAS) of the first data that does not exceed the capacity of the mobile device; and sending the subset of the first data to the client process (C7, L10-44).

5. Claim 14 is a computer readable medium variation of claim 1 that does not teach or further define over the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

6. As per claims 2 and 15, Kanevsky teaches the method of Claims 1 and 14, wherein:

the device profile information includes a form factor describing a number of lines and a number of characters per line of a display component of the mobile device; and the capacity is based on the form factor (col. 6, lines 20-27).

7. As per claims 3 and 16, Kanevsky teaches the method of Claims 1 and 14, wherein:

the device profile information includes a buffer size describing a number of characters the mobile device can receive on input without loss of input data; and the capacity is based on the buffer size (Col 6, Lines 20-27).

8. As per claims 4 and 17, Kanevsky teaches the method of Claims 1 and 14, wherein:

the first data (data received by WPAS from web site) indicates that a particular graphical element of the plurality of graphical elements is current; and the subset (reformatted data by the WPAS) includes the particular graphical element (col. 7, lines 25-33).

9. As per claims 5 and 18, Kanevsky teaches the method of Claims 1 and 14, the step of managing the information at the mobile applications server further comprising:

requesting the device profile information from the mobile device (col. 6, lines 20-27); receiving the profile information from the mobile device; and storing the device profile information (col. 7, lines 16-19).

10. As per claims 6 and 19, Kanevsky teaches the method of Claims 1 and 14, the step of managing the information at the mobile applications server further comprising: receiving a request for service from the mobile device; determining a mobile device type from the request for service (col. 7, lines 16-29); and

retrieving the device profile information from a database based on the device type (C8, L44-59).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 7-13 and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of "Official Notice".

13. As per claims 7, Kanevsky teaches a method of interacting between a mobile device (113d, fig. 1) connected to a network over a wireless link for managing information at a mobile applications server (107, fig. 1; or WPAS) including device profile data (col. 6, lines 20-27). The mobile application server receives data in a plurality of formats from a plurality of content servers (105, 106, fig. 1) and converts the

data into formats that are compatible and displayable by the plurality of devices (col. 5, lines 5-15) including mobile and industrial devices. Kanevsky also teaches after the data conversion process, the mobile application server sends the converted data back to the intermediate server (104, fig. 1) to be transported to the mobile device for display (col. 7, lines 10-44). Kanevsky does not explicitly teach determining whether an external converter is available for performing a conversion and having the mobile application server perform the conversion when external converter cannot convert to a certain format. "Official Notice" is taken that it is well known in the art to provide helper application or external processing to reduce work on the main unit. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have an external converter with Kanevsky teaching because it would have reduced the load on the WPAS. It is apparent that Kanevsky as modified would have the WPAS perform the conversion if there is no external converter that can perform the conversion.

14. Claim 20 is a computer readable medium variation of claim 7 that does not teach or further define over the limitations of claim 7. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7.

15. As per claims 8 and 21, Kanevsky as modified would have the steps of determining whether the external converter converts to the second description using the particular format, then sending the first data to the external converter because it would

have enabled the system to ensure an external converter is available to perform the conversion.

16. As per claims 9 and 22, Kanevsky teaches a plurality of devices (including wireless and industrial) capable of sending, accessing, and retrieving data from a plurality of web sites and content servers via the WPAS in a plurality of formats as noted above by using Internet Protocols such as HTTP (col. 6, lines 11-13). Hence, it is inherent that a particular format such as the Telnet protocol is supported by the WPAS as well.

17. As per claims 10-13 and 23-26, Kanevsky teaches the WPAS that supports a plurality of scripting languages (including markup languages such as HTML) and other programs that can be reformatted and transmitted between the content servers on the world wide web (WWW) and the plurality of devices (including wireless and industrial devices) (C8, L15-23). It is well known and expected in the art to implement a system that is versatile and adaptable in order to support a plurality of devices using a plurality of formats and languages such as WAP, VoXML, HDML, XSL, etc.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Device Aware Internet Portal – Jiang et al, 6,741,853
- Method and Apparatus For Transcoding Character Sets Between Internet Hosts and Thin Client Devices Over Data Networks – Greer et al, 6,247,048
- Dynamically Provided Content Processor For Transcoded Data Types at Intermediate Stages of Transcoding Process – Dutta et al, 6,615,212
- Intelligent Harvesting and Navigation System and Method – Jamtgaard et al, 6,430,624
- System For Dynamically Transcoding Data Transmitted Between Computers – Tso et al, 6,421,733

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack P Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 605-4299. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). jpn

Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner